

which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Public Health'."

Demand No. 24.—Rural Development.

40-A. RURAL DEVELOPMENT.

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 1,65,85,000 be granted to the Government to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending 31st day of March 1961, in respect of 'Rural Development'."

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS

Re.—Changing the Name of "Mysore" to "Karnataka"

Mr. SPEAKER.—Non-official resolution. Sri M. K. Bommegowda will speak.

Sri M. K. BOMMEGOWDA (Krishnarajpet).—I have concluded my speech.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—Sir, I have given a notice of motion under rule 227 read with rule 30 (2) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business, in connection with the resolution of Sri M. Ramappa. With your permission I move this motion :

"That the debate on the Hon'ble Member Sri M. Ramappa's resolution for changing the name of Mysore to Karnataka be adjourned *sine die*."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the debate on the Hon'ble Member Sri M. Ramappa's resolution for changing the name of Mysore to Karnataka be adjourned *sine die*."

ಶ್ರೀ ಕದಿದಾಳ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮೀ, ಡಾ. ನಾಗೂರವರ ಅಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳಗಾಗುವ

ದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಪ್ಪುಪಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಕನ್ನಡ ದಲ್ಲೇ ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಾದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯ.

***Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA** (Nanjangud).—On a point of order. I want to ask whether the rules quoted by the Hon'ble Minister are applicable to the circumstances of the case.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It is an adjournment motion.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In regard to motions for adjournment itself, I have something to say. Chapter XV of the Rules of Procedure relates to the resolutions and Chapter XVI relates to Motions. Rule 227 says :

"At any time after a motion has been made, a member may move that the debate on the motion be adjourned".

That is so far as motions are concerned. If we read the provisions relating to resolutions there is no corresponding section which enables a member to move for adjournment. It is very clear and there is a fundamental difference between resolutions and motions. Nowhere has any specific provision been made for postponement or adjournment of a resolution. A resolution is one which has been tabled for discussion as a result of a ballot and it is not as if it is a special motion. It is a formal resolution which has been admitted by the Speaker in accordance with rule 133 of the Rules of Procedure. Therefore, I want to know how the Minister for Revenue can move for postponement of the resolution under rule 277 read with 30 (2). The rules mentioned by the Minister apply exclusively to ordinary motions. The burden of my song is that there is no corresponding rule relating to resolutions.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Mr. Speaker, the Hon'ble Member tries to make a distinction between a motion and a resolution. A motion is general whereas a resolution is special. Every resolution comes in the shape of a motion. Rule 277 applies to the procedure to be followed in general.

Therefore, the rule referred to by me is relevant and it applies to the adjournment of discussion in connection with a resolution or any other motion.

***Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY** (Coondapur).—I am surprised that a lawyer of the standing of the Revenue Minister should propound such an argument before the House. He must know that when a specific rule is there, the general rule does not apply. The rule of law is, when specific rule applies to a certain issue, the general rule does not apply. Now we have got two chapters specifically for Motions and for Resolutions. There is a general rule to motions. The procedure for resolutions is given in Chapter XV. For example rule 133 says:

“A member other than a Minister who wishes to move a resolution shall give fifteen clear days’ notice of his intention and shall, together with the notice, submit the text of the resolution which he wishes to move”.

Let us read rule 147 :

“Notice of a motion shall be given in writing addressed to the Secretary.”

It is abundantly clear that a notice which comes under Chapter XV is different from a motion which does not require 15 days’ notice. So, how can the rules which come under Chapter 15 be applied to the rules coming under Chapter 16? If we take each rule separately, the rules under Chapter XVI are different from Chapter XV. I have been searching for a similar rule under resolutions but nowhere there is such a rule. When a resolution is before the House, just because the ruling party has an absolute majority, where is the right for moving adjournment of the discussion? At this rate, if there is an inconvenient resolution moved by a member of this side, they can practically eliminate any resolution. This interpretation is very peculiar and if it is given effect to, you can throttle any resolution moved by the Opposition.

What prevents the Treasury Benches from giving a motion of adjournment on every resolution we move? Is such a thing contemplated under the rules? Only in cases of special motion, there can be a motion for adjournment during the debate. What the Hon’ble Revenue Minister is propounding is very dangerous. I know it is a very inconvenient resolution...

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I have not said anything about the motion. Let the Hon’ble Member deal with the admissibility of the motion.

Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—I am saying that legally you have no case. Morally also you have no case. Morally it is wrong. It is cutting at the very root of the rights of the members of this House, especially the Opposition, i. e., if this procedure is allowed, you can throttle every resolution. Such a procedure is never contemplated. I appeal to the members on the other side not to move this resolution. It is not admissible. It is not contemplated. You bring in a new rule and then you can make it. But the rule propounded by my friend does not apply. I completely support the point of order of my friend. The resolution may be ruled out.

***Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN** (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, I would like to say a few words in support of the observations of my friends Sri Srinivas Shetty and Sri Mallaradhya. I fail to see how a resolution and a motion can be on the same footing. If we refer to rule 279, it is only in respect of a motion, a procedure regarding voting, whereas in respect of a resolution, in rule 144 and 143, it is said clearly that in the case of a resolution the question of voting is automatically provided. In the case of a motion, a distinction is made. If a motion comes up before the House, you cannot automatically take it up for voting. There should be a substantial motion saying that it is to be put for the voting of the House and the final opinion of the House has got to be ascertained. Even in respect of the final conclusive portion, the operative portion of a resolution and motion, there is a distinction. Secondly in respect of a motion there is one more

(SRI M. C. NARASIMHAN)

thing. A motion has got to be confined to a matter of recent occurrence, whereas a resolution may not be of recent occurrence. It may be of a thing of a by-gone age...

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Where is it prescribed that a motion should be pertaining to a matter of recent occurrence?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Please read rule 148, sub-clause (4): "It shall be restricted to a matter of recent occurrence..."

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN.—One type of motion.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I am not entering into a cross discussion. Rule 148 makes perfectly clear that a motion is admissible when the Speaker admits it. But in the case of a resolution, there is no question of the Speaker coming in saying that the resolution is not admissible. Well, Sir, when there is a distinction made between a resolution and a motion and especially in the manner of voting down a motion, I fail to see how two things can be put on the same footing. If you refer to rule 278 dealing with the motion of adjournment, 278 (1), (2) and (3) the sum and substance is that it is never intended to refer to a resolution of the type before the House. It can only refer to a motion apart from a private member's resolution and it can refer to a Bill before the House. We respectfully submit that you should not give concurrence to this at all. What harm is there? You can take action under other rules. You can ask Mr. Ramappa to withdraw. I believe he is prepared to withdraw...

MEMBERS.—No, no, no.

Sri M. RAMAPPA.—May I know why Sri Narasimhan thinks that I am prepared to withdraw?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—It is open to the Hon'ble Revenue Minister—he being always wedded to old Mysore and not Karnataka—to persuade Sri Ramappa. But this is not the way. This is dangerous and you should not allow.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—I wish to say a few words in reply to what is

stated by my friends Sri Srinivas Shetty and Sri Narasimhan. I have already stated and I will cover the points raised. I have already said that Chapter 24 deals with the general rules of procedure. It deals with the notices to be given by members, the circulation of notices, disallowances or amendments by the Speaker, motions not to be published until admitted, etc., etc. If it is the contention of the Hon'ble Members that with regard to certain matters, this chapter should not be invoked, then that means that some of the provisions contained in Chapter 24 will not have any application. I will read Rule 280 which relates to "anticipating discussion".

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Which one?

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—For instance rule 280. And then Rule 285 relating to rules to be observed by members. Is it the contention of the Hon'ble Members on the other side that 285 is not applicable to resolutions? For instance take Rule 292—is it the contention of the Hon'ble Members that Rule 292 has no application when a resolution is being discussed? Therefore my submission is.....

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—You are off the tangent.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—No. It is my friends on the other side who want to make hair-splitting distinctions. I am perfectly within the bounds of the rules, when I sought your permission to move this motion. There is one more point which I wish to urge in support of my arguments. I rely upon rule 30 clause (2). Sri Narasimhan wanted to argue that a resolution can never be dismissed by an adjournment motion. That is not the case. It is clear:

"When the debate on a Private Members' Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may, if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or resolution on a subsequent day allotted for Private

Member's business, give notice for resumption of the adjourned debate and on receipt of such notice the relative precedence of such Bill or resolution shall be determined by ballot."

That means, a discussion on a resolution can be adjourned *sine die* and when it is so adjourned *sine die*, it is open to the Hon'ble Member who has tabled the resolution or moved the resolution to give notice of his intention to move it once again. Therefore, there is nothing in the rules which prohibits me from moving this Motion.

(Sri J. B. Mallaradhya and Sri K. Kenchappa were standing.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I will give a chance to Sri Kenchappa.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, the Minister has raised a new point and also it is I who raised the point of order. I would like to say something on the new point raised by the Minister.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have heard both the parties sufficiently.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Sir, my friend has raised a new point. He referred to section 30 (2) which was never mentioned at all. Under what circumstances does this rule apply?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, a point like this has arisen for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Do not think for a moment that whatever is said by the Hon'ble Minister is accepted by me.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I know, Sir, that the Chair will give a correct ruling. Even if you give a wrong ruling, I will accept it.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is not fair.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I beg your pardon, Sir. For the first time a matter like this has been raised on the floor of the House. Whatever decision we may take on this issue is going to affect the entire proceedings on the floor of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Kenchappa may speak now.

L.A.

Sri K. KENCHAPPA (Hiriyur).—Sir, in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the House, there are different rules which refer to notices, motions and resolutions under different chapters. According to this Chapter, the first thing is Notice. Even if a charitable interpretation is to be given, it must be considered that those rules up to 270 must be considered only with reference to Notice as contemplated in various previous provisions. Next, the other things come in the name of Motions. They commence from rule 271 up to the end of anticipating discussion and so on. Therefore, these Motions as contemplated in various other Chapters of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business are to be applied and these rules commencing from 271 and including 277 up to 279 must be applied only with reference to Motions and not with reference to Resolutions as contemplated in various Chapters. Such being the case, with what stretch of imagination can we say that rule 277 under Chapter 15 applies? Therefore, this specific mention of "Notices and Motions" and omission to mention "Resolution" as contemplated in Chapter 15, shall certainly give us the idea that the Chapter 24 and the provisions thereunder do not apply to any of the questions arising in Chapter 15. Therefore, according to me, rule 277 is not applicable in the present case.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಯು.ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ (ಚಾಮರಾಜನಗರ).—ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ನಿರ್ಣಯವೊಂದು ಏನಿತ್ತು ಅದರ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಅನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟಕಾಲದವರೆಗೂ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮ ನಿಯಮಾವಳಿಗಳ ರೂಲ್ 277ರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸೂಚನೆ ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಅವರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಬೇಡವೆಂದು ಭಾಗ್ಯವುಳ್ಳ ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ದಿನಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಅವರು ತಮ್ಮ ಸೂಚನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿಲ್ಲದಿರುವ ಕಾರಣ ಈಗ ಅವರು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರುವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂದಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು, ಅಂದರೆ, ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಲ್ಪಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತೋ ಅದನ್ನು, ಈ ದಿವಸ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲ; ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ಮೊದಲನೇ ಅಂಶ.

ಇನ್ನು ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿದ್ದ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕಾಲಹರಣ ಅಗಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿ ಇದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈವರೆಗಾಗಲೇ ಇದರ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಯು. ಎಂ. ಮಾದಪ್ಪ)

ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಯಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇದರಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅನೇಕರಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಷ್ಟು ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಜಾರಾಗಿ ದ್ದರೆ ಒಂದು ಕ್ಲೋಜರ್‌ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೂವ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದಿತ್ತು. ಆದರೆ ಅವರಿಗೇನೋ ಒಂದು ಕಷ್ಟ ಬಂದಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಈಗ ಇದರ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸುವುದು ಬೇಡ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ನೋಡೋಣ ಎಂಬ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಈಗ ಅವರು ಈ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಈಗ ಮಾನ್ಯ ರವಿನ್ಯೂ ವಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮುಂದಿನಂತಕ್ಕೆ ಮೋಷನ್ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಸಂವೇಶಕ್ಕೊಳಗಾಗಿ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದು ಕ್ರಮಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ತಪ್ಪು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಿಂದ ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪಗಳ ನಿರೂಪಗಳು ಕರ್ತವ್ಯಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿವೆ. ಈಗಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗಳಿಗಿಂತಲೂ ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಮಗೆ ಮುಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಪ್ಪಕ್ಕರು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತೆಂದು ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಪ್ಪಲ್ಲ ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

* Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, I would like to submit that there is no *prima facie* case and Rule 277 does not apply for this simple reason. The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that the Motion under the Chapter was general and that all other similar provisions, that is, Resolution, e.c., were special. There is absolutely no substance in this argument and it cuts at the very root of the privilege of this House under the various provisions. For instance, there are the rights and privileges of this House under the Chapter "Resolution" and rights and privileges of this House under the Chapter "Adjournment Motion". For instance, when an adjournment motion is admitted by the Speaker, in such a case, can the Hon'ble Minister come forward with this rule 277 and move for the adjournment of the Adjournment Motion that has been admitted by the Speaker? In rule 278 (1) it has been specifically provided that in a case where any member seeks to abuse any other rule by resorting to rule 277, in such a case the Speaker shall not allow any Member to make use of rule 277. So, I request the Hon'ble Speaker not to allow this motion to be moved.

Sri C. K. RAJIAH SETTY (Chick-naikanhalli).—Sir, the very object of having a ballot for the resolutions is to fix the priority of the Resolutions. This adjournment motion relates to postponement of this parti-

cular Resolution. This is not clear at all. According to this adjournment motion, if this resolution is postponed and another resolution is taken up, then the priority given to this resolution according to ballot is lost. This is really very unfortunate and also it is not admissible. Secondly, the rule which the Minister quoted says only when the House is adjourned when non-official business is going on, it has thereby to be adjourned *sine die*. That does not apply now because we have got four days when we can discuss this Resolution. Adjourning *sine die* has no meaning. Thirdly, there is nothing in the Rules of Procedure to show how it is to be taken up again when it is adjourned to an uncertain time. Under these circumstances, I think in fair justice it is better that the Minister should withdraw this.

Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Madhugiri).—My friend Sri Mallaradhya says that rule 277 is not applicable and that it is applicable to a separate motion on the floor of the House. Even according to the resolution, what has been moved by the Hon'ble Minister for Revenue is a motion. If he says that rule 277 could be applied to a motion, let them apply it to this motion and let this be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The position at present is, we have to consider whether a resolution is a motion. It is a very simple matter. I thought there would be no argument as to whether a resolution was a motion. Because in some Legislative Assemblies it has been defined. I know for certain in Bombay that a resolution is a motion. There are different kinds of motions: there is the "ordinary motion;" there is the "special motion;" for adjournment;" and there may be a motion for consideration of certain matters. All these are motions and naturally a resolution is also a motion, though a resolution is a different kind of motion. If I hold that a resolution is a motion, rule 277 applies and naturally the Minister for Revenue is entitled to make a motion for adjournment of the debate.

Now the House adjourns and will meet after half an hour.

The House adjourned for recess at Four Minutes past Three of the Clock and re-assembled at Thirty-Six Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair.]

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—May I have a little clarification about your ruling? Did you say that this particular resolution was as good as a motion and that rule 277 applied to the resolution also?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is what I said. I say that a resolution is a kind of motion and in the Rules of Procedure of Bombay it has been defined that a resolution is also a motion. At one time it was thought proper to enter into our own Rules of Procedure defining that a resolution is a motion; but on a second thought it was thought not necessary because it was obvious.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Now that the motion is there, can we speak?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes; the adjournment motion is there; the Hon'ble Minister speaks on that.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೆ, ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಹಾಗೆ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಬಹಳ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯ. ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಬದಲಾಯಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿತ್ತು; ಮತ್ತು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತನಾಡಲು ಕಾತುರರಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಂತೆ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಉಳಿದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಕಳೆದ ಎರಡು ಅಧಿವೇಶನಗಳಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬರಲು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಪುನಃ ಈ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡದ್ದೇ ಅದರ ಅದೇಶವಾಗಿಯೂ ಉಳಿದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿವೆ. ಇದೂ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ.

ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮೇಟಿಯವರು ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿವೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ಸೂಚಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ದೊರೆಯಬೇಕು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡುವುದೇ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ನಾನು ಇವತ್ತು ನಿರ್ಣಯದಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಅನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ “Immoral” ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನ್ಯತಿಕವಾದುದಾಗಲಿ, ನೀತಿಗೆ ವ್ಯತಿರಿಕ್ತವಾದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಲಿ ಈ ಕಡೆ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಚ್ಛೆಪಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಎದುರು ಪಕ್ಷದವರ ತಂದದರಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದಮೇಲೆ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆಸಬಾರದೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಲ್ಲ.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಂ. ಸಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹ. —ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಎಂದು ಒಗ್ಗಡ್ಡೆಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅದು ಬೇರೆ ವಿಷಯ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಎಷ್ಟೋಬಾರಿ ಎರೋಡ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಂದಿದ್ದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿವೆ. ಕೆಲವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದೂ ನನ್ನ ನೆನಪಿನಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಎರೋಡ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಬ್ಬರು ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರಾದ ಕಾರಣ ಇದನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಈ ಕಡೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ವಿನಯ ಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮಗೆ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶವಿಲ್ಲ, ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ಐವತ್ತು ಅರವತ್ತು ಜನರು ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಎ. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ಅರವತ್ತು ಜನ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಆ ಕಡೆಯೂ ಇರಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ.—ನಮ್ಮ ಕಡೆ ಇಲ್ಲ, ಯಾರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ; ಬೇಕಾದರೆ closure motion ಹಾಕಬಹುದು.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ.—ಅವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿ, ಇತರ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅಡ್ಡಿಬಾರದಂತೆ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಹಾಕುವುದು ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಈ ರೀತಿ ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

* Sri V. SRINIVASA SHETTY.—Sir, I should like to say one or two words with regard to the merits of the resolution. How hollow some of the arguments advanced for the adjournment of the resolution are is quite clear. That the State should be named “Karnataka” is a very old thing and practically no new arguments can be advanced. Everybody knows everything about it. This resolution has

(SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY)

been before this Assembly for the last 3 years. It is not the Opposition alone, but Hon'ble Members on the other side also have moved resolutions and very few members have kept silent on this issue. Practically everybody has spoken and now when the Hon'ble Minister comes and says that 60 more members on the other side want to speak on it, I am surprised how to describe it. Words fail me and I leave it to the Speaker. Fortunately for us he did not say that all the 149 members on the other side want to take part in the debate on the resolution.

Sri T. D. MARANNA (Magadi).—All those who have not taken part so far are anxious to do so now.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF (Broadway).—Sir, are we going to speak on the merits of the case or merely on the motion for adjournment which has been moved?

Mr. SPEAKER.—On the adjournment motion. We are not discussing the subject matter of the resolution.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—Since you have given a ruling that a motion is a resolution and resolution is a motion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not said so.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—We bow to your ruling. But still a very pertinent and substantial question remains. Even after the Speaker has given the ruling that motion includes resolution, a substantial question still remains whether this adjournment motion comes within the purview of rule 278 or not. Rule 278 says: "If the Speaker is of the opinion that a motion for adjournment of the debate is an abuse of the rules of the Assembly....." That is the crucial question now. The point at issue is, if it is decided that the motion is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly the Speaker may either forthwith put the question or decline to propose the question. I submit that it is abundantly clear that it is not a new question. It has been thrashed out threadbare and practically every member has taken part in the debate. If my Hon'ble friend had not moved this motion I for one was about to move a closure motion because we had discussed it threadbare.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Will you please read the whole rule? If the motion for adjournment were an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly, I would not have allowed it here.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I will have to make out a case that it is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to know in what way rule 278 comes in is the picture.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—You have given a ruling to the effect that it is a motion. We bow down to it.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—(Mangalore-1).—On a point of order, Sir. A suggestion is thrown out that there is something left over after you have given your ruling. You have considered it and then you have given a ruling and admitted it. Now I do not know whether the Chair has got the power to disallow it on any ground whatever including that it is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly. Anything that should have been considered should have been considered before the ruling was given and that cannot be open now for consideration after the ruling is given. After the ruling is given and after it is admitted, the implication is that it is not an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—My friend is simply splitting very thin hair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have not held that it is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—We are going to make out a case for you to decide. We want to make out that it is a motion which is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly and comes under rule 278.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let us understand one position that rule 277 applies to the present case and according to that rule a motion for adjournment of the debate has been made. We are now discussing the motion for adjournment. You can say whether you oppose the motion for adjournment or whether you are in favour of it.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I am opposing the motion for adjournment. The reason for opposing is that it is an abuse of the rules.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—What is the procedure that you want to follow?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have made it quite clear that I have allowed the motion to be made in this House under rule 277. If Hon'ble Members want to oppose it, they have a right to oppose the motion and they may try to impress upon me that it is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly and so they oppose it. I asked Sri Srinivas Shetty as to whether rule 278 applied to the case and as he holds that rule 278 applies in this case he opposes the motion on that score.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, we want to convince you that it is an abuse of the rule 278. But why is my friend Sri Baliga threatening that it is not open to you to do anything after you have given the ruling?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not come in to the picture at all. It is not a point of order raised under rule 278. He is only making his arguments to oppose the motion.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—The mere fact that the motion is there does not mean that the Chair has forthwith put the question or declined to put the question. There are two things open to the Chair. After having admitted the motion, the Chair can forthwith put the question or decline to put the question. Now, I request that the Chair may be pleased to decline to put the question.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It must be remembered that the main question before the House is the subject matter of the resolution, and not the question of the motion.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I submit, Sir, that it is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—In that case, I would not have allowed it at all.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—My submission is that the Chair has not applied its mind as to whether it is an abuse of the Rules of Procedure or not. We are making out a case that it is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly. This resolution has been before the House continuously for three sessions and I fail to see how many members will participate in this debate unless

my friend instigates all the members to do so.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Sir, I object to that insinuation. Where is the need for it?

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—I shall withdraw the word 'instigate' and substitute the word 'encourage' for it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I may suggest to my leader that 'persuade' is a better word.

Sri V. SRINIVAS SHETTY.—It is very unlikely that such a large number will come forward and speak on this resolution. There is no new argument to be advanced. The whole thing is a stale matter. The best thing is to put the matter to the House and decide it once and for all. I, therefore, once again submit that this motion before the House is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly and as such it should be thrown out. My friend said that it is not immoral or unethical. I still adhere to the statement I made. This is an unheard of thing. My friend said that they have allowed a number of resolutions to be discussed by the other side. It is very generous of him! When insignificant subjects come up, they allow discussion on them. They throw crumbs here and there. When anything is inconvenient to them, they do not want to allow discussion on it. Why can't you face this inconvenient and unpleasant resolution? What is the difficulty? There are three more days and why can't you allow us to discuss it for the next three days? I may give the guarantee on behalf of the Opposition that none from the Opposition will take part in the debate. If it is the intention that it should be discussed one day or the other, why postpone discussion on it? It seems to me that their only idea is not to allow this resolution to be discussed at all. Hence it is an abuse of the Rules of this Assembly. We have discussed the main resolution threadbare and it should be put to vote and this motion should not be adopted.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Suppose this motion is postponed *sine die*, will it get priority in the next session or will it have to be ballotted again?

Mr. SPEAKER.—It will have to take its chance again. Please read rule 32.

* ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯಾ.—ಸ್ಯಾಸಿ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಖಾತೆಯ ಸಚಿವರು ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಈ ಮೋಷಣೆ ಏನಿದೆ ಅದು ನಮಗೆ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಮಹಾಸಭೆಯ ಹಿಂದಿನ ಎರಡು-ಮೂರು ಅಧಿವೇಶನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅನೇಕ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದರಷ್ಟೇ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳೂ ಕೂಡ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿವೆ. ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ ಹಿಂದೆಯೂ ಈ ವಿಧವಾದಂಥ ಮನೋಭಾವವನ್ನು ನೂಟಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ ಅವರ ಒಂದು ಸೌಜನ್ಯ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಈ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಷ್ಟೊಂದು ಜನ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ, ಇದರಷ್ಟೇ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯಗಳು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಬೇಕಾಗಿವೆ ಅಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಇದಕ್ಕೇಕೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಕಳೆಯಬೇಕು? ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಲಿಸಿ ಅವರವರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ನೂಟಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಏಕೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕು? ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವಿಧವಾದಂಥ ಪ್ರತಿಭಟನೆ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕು ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಖಚಿತ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಸಬಾರದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇನ್ನು 60 ಜನ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರೂ ಆಷ್ಟೆ. After all it is a question of sentiment. ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಪರವಾಗಿಯೂ, ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವರು ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿಯೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಚರ್ಚಾಂಶಗಳೆನೂ ಕಾಣಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನನಗೆ ಈಗ ಶೋಚುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಎರೋಡ್ ಆದಳತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ಸಂಧಿಗ್ನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒದಗಿದೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸೂಕ್ತ ನಿರ್ಧಾರವನ್ನು ಕೂಡರೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ದಾಕ್ಷಿಣ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಒಳಗಾಗಬೇಕರಾಗಿ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ನಿರ್ಧಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಕಷ್ಟಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೊಳಪಡುತ್ತೇವೋ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಆ ಕಷ್ಟಸ್ಥಿತಿಯನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಒಂದು ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಇನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಬೇರೆ ವಾದವನ್ನೂ ಇಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ವಾದದ ತಿರುಳು ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದೇನು ವಾದವೇ ಅಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯವೆಂದು ನಾವು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೇ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಹಿಂದಿನ ಎರಡು ಅಧಿವೇಶನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಏಕೆ ಕ್ಯೂಸ್ಟರ್ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಿದಿರಿ? ಏನೋ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿಳುವಳಿಕೆ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಕ್ಯೂಸ್ಟರ್ ಈ ವಾದ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದೇ ಪ್ರಥಮ ನಮ್ಮ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸ್ಪೆಷಿಲಿಸ್ಟ್ ಶ್ರೀನಿವಾಸ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ ಅವರು ಇಮ್ಮಾರ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಅದು lack of morality ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಎರಡು ಕಡೆಯೂ ಜಿದ್ದು ಹುಟ್ಟುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಈಗ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಅಂತ್ಯನಿರ್ಧಾರ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಏನು ಕಷ್ಟ ಬರುತ್ತದೋ ಎಂದು ಅವರ ಕಡೆಯ ಕೆಲವರು ಅನುಮಾನ

ಪಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ 278ನೆಯ ಕಲಂ ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಅವರು ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇಂತಹ ಮೋಷಣೆ ಬಂದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಕಾರ್ಯಕಲಾಪಗಳು ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶ ಕಾಣುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಾವೇ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಡುವುದು ಒಂದು. ಮೋಷಣೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಾಗ್ಗೆ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ತಮಗೆ ಮನವರಿಕೆಯಾಗುತ್ತಿರುವ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಸದೆ ಸಭೆಯ ಕೆಲಸಕ್ಕೆ ನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದು ಇನ್ನೊಂದು. ಈಗ ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಧಾರವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲೇಬೇಕು. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ತಾವು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ರೂಲ್ 278 ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೋ, ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಪಕ್ಷದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಯಾರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಲ್ಲಗೇ ಇದನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿ ಒಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾವು ಒಂದು ಮೋಷಣೆ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳಿ. ಆಗ ಅವರು 150 ಜನರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಎಲ್ಲರನ್ನೂ ಕರೆದು

4 P.M.

ಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದು ಒಟ್ಟು ಮಾಡಿಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಏಕೆ ಖಚಿತವಾದ ನಿರ್ಧಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಬಾರದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅದನ್ನಾದರೂ ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಪ್ರತಿಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಹೇಳಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವುದು ಸಾಧುವಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಆಗುವುದಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗಬಹುದು. ಅದರ ಕೆಲವರಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೋ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದೆ. ಪಂಚಾಯತಿ ಬಿಲ್ ತಂದಾಗ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕಾೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರು ಇರಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಇದು ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಅಥವಾ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನಿರ್ವಹಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರನ್ನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಇಷ್ಟ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಸುಬ್ರಹ್ಮಣ್ಯ (ನ್ಯಾಯಾಂಗ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ನಮ್ಮ ಇಷ್ಟ ಅಲ್ಲ ನಿಮ್ಮ ಇಷ್ಟದಂತೆಯೇ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY (Malavalli).—As officers are to a certain extent not democrats, we did not like the idea of putting the Deputy Commissioner as Chairman.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I can only have pity. I do not want to say anything further.

ಪ್ರಜಾಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ತತ್ವವನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ಹಿಡಿದು ಶಾಶ್ವತ ಗೊಳಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಈ ಯುಗದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಡೆಪ್ಯುಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರನ್ನು ಎರ್ರಾ ಪಾರ್ಲಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳ, ರೆಜಿಸ್ಟ್ರೇಟರ್ಸ್ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಮೆಂಬರುಗಳ ತರೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಇಡುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ತತ್ವ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗಿದೆ.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—Retired men are more democratic.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜಿ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ಡೆಮೋಕ್ರಸಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದು Retired people ಅವರ ಜನ್ಮಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಹಕ್ಕು ಅಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರಿಗಳೂ ಬಯಸುತ್ತಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದ ಸಕಾರಣವನ್ನೂ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ. ಉದ್ದೇಶ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕಾಣುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದರಿಂದ ಈ 278ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಪನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮಗೇನಾದರೂ ಕಷ್ಟವಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನನಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಇದನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

* Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—Mr. Speaker Sir, I do not think that the motion which has been placed before us for our acceptance by Sri Kadidal Manjappa, our Hon'ble Revenue Minister, can give scope for so much of discussion. It is a very very simple matter—too simple to be explained in words. Here is a resolution moved by my friend Sri Ramappa, a resolution about the nomenclature to be given to this State of ours. Now the Hon'ble Minister Sri Kadidal Manjappa has placed before us a proposition to the effect that resolution may be postponed for certain reasons. It is a very simple thing.

We have to consider now not the original resolution but the motion that has been placed before us by Sri Kadidal Manjappa. Although he has not placed before us all the reasons for such a postponement of the original resolution, it seems to be deserving of some consideration. This motion says that the resolution about the nomenclature of the State should not be moved for the time being because in the general interest of the country, in the interest of the homogeneity of the Mysore State and the times in which we are living, it seems to me to lend itself to the consideration that it must be postponed. There are ominous clouds hanging over the country. I do not want to dilate upon that aspect just now. Still the emotional integration has not yet taken place. There are further so many schemes involving colossal schemes pending before us which requires our consideration and thought. The Hon'ble Minister is therefore making out a case.....

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The postponement and keeping Mysore is

also part of that scheme which you are mentioning!

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—So Sir, it seems to be that in the general interest of the country, it is better to postpone consideration of this resolution. I assure you Sir, no petty consideration has prompted him to bring forward this motion. He says that because the times are not propitious, let us wait for better times. We are still on the fringe of nation-building activities. The expected progress is still not achieved. Why should we bring in this sort of a controversy at this time? Some people say that the nomenclature should be changed. I only say that it is not proper to divert our attention on that subject just now. I therefore beg of my Hon'ble friends to take all aspects into consideration and pass the motion which is under consideration. That is my submission.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—Sir, let me appeal to all the Hon'ble Members of this House through you that what may be a norm today will be rubbish tomorrow or some days hence. We have taken a decision to the effect that this State should be called as Mysore. Parliament has also put its seal of approval and passed the law in this behalf. Not only on this issue, even on the question of boundary, we have accepted the law in the matter and we have accepted that name Mysore should be there. I refer to the fact that India was not independent but was desirous of becoming independent and we have all worked under the common institution, namely, the Congress Organisation....

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Is this one of the 60 speeches referred to....

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may kindly speak on the motion before the House.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—I am speaking on the motion, Sir. What I say is relevant to the issue before the House Sir. I was saying here that there was a time when it ransacked the brains of political thinkers and writers: "was India a nation at all?" But now another factor has come into existence at the hands of intelligent legislators, and that

(SRI M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY)

is about the name. And then comes caste, creed, sub-caste—all these things. We are living in such crucial times; we have to face several dangers threatening the country at large. With due respect to the mover of the original resolution, I say that in the larger interests of the country, that resolution ought not to have been tabled at all.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—It is very objectionable, Sir. How can he say that that resolution which is in a state of suspended animation, should not have been tabled, Sir? He is not required to say that. He can only speak about the adjournment motion before the House. That is the issue before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER.—(Addressing Sri Narasimhan) You did not hear what he said. He says that having regard to the interests of the country, in the first place, that resolution should not have been moved and in the second place, having moved that resolution, the only course is to see that it is postponed.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—I am giving wide margin and latitude to my friend who is also young like me.

Sir, I was saying that the time is not propitious to discuss a subject of this sort and I once again say that a day may come to the legislators here—either we may be here or our successors may be here, when they may change their views. Let us wait for some time. Nothing will be lost.

With these words, I say that our Hon'ble Minister Sri Kadidal Manjappa has risen to the occasion in saying that discussion should be postponed and I fully endorse his idea. I only request Hon'ble Members not to complicate the issue and take away the precious time of the House.

* Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I oppose the motion for adjournment. Talking on merits, you said that under rule 277 it is admissible. We have got to see the practical purpose behind that rule. I believe it was intended to postpone discussion for the next day. It is still open to the mover of the resolution Sri M. Ramappa to say that under rule 277 it can be taken up tomorrow.

Supposing you agree to the motion, I do not think any purpose is served. If it is strictly taken into view that it is intended to take up this resolution on a future date, then we can take action. But, here is a resolution which is not found wanting to have practical, *bona fide* or genuine reason. If only it was stipulated that we can take it up after 15 days or at the end of the month, I could have understood it. But without mentioning a definite and clear date can we pass the motion moved by the Revenue Minister? When he says that this should be adjourned *sine die*, I want to know what is the reason behind it. Even the Revenue Minister who is one of the wisest persons of this House, wants to postpone it for some other time but he does not indicate a date. So, what is the intention behind this? It is only to see that the debate does not really take place. So, when this motion does not indicate definite date, and when this motion does not clearly say on what date the resumed debate will take place, I do feel that it is a motion intended to defeat one of the fundamental rights of a member, namely, the right of concluding a debate on the question. After all, why do we move a resolution? It is in order to ascertain the opinion of members of this House. Otherwise it will be meaningless. Do we discuss here abstract questions? We discuss here for the definite purpose of ascertaining the views of this august House. This question has been discussed thrice and here Sri M. Ramappa would have withdrawn it if there was not this motion. Or we could have persuaded him to withdraw it. If he presses it and if you have pointed out the serious objections, he may have withdrawn it. Instead of that, this method of disposing of the resolution that is before us is not correct. Why should the Hon'ble Minister resort to such a dubious way?

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Deputy Minister for Finance).—If you want to kill the motion of the Revenue Minister, you ask your friend Sri M. Ramappa to withdraw the original resolution.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—You will kindly see, Sir, that the Deputy Finance Minister has let the cat out of the bag.

It is very clear that the Revenue Minister's intention is to kill this resolution.

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN.—I said if you want to kill the motion that is now under discussion.....

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—You are also, I think, for “Karnataka” and could you in all fairness...

Mr. SPEAKER.—Please do not drag me into this question. On account of this resolution so much has been said against me. I can only say that I am a Speaker occupying the chair.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—The spirit of the resolution is ahead of the times obtaining in the country. If at all we are interested in the masses, we must take a decision to the effect that the resolution can be postponed for another 25 years.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—If that is the position, let us postpone it for 25 years. It is better we take a decision at least to that effect. Obviously when Sri Kadidal Manjappa does not stand for the name “Karnataka” he is keen on defeating this.

Sri KADIDAL MANJAPPA.—Why should you drag my name individually?

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—He does not say anything definite. By this motion the right of the member to discuss is taken away. If a definite date is fixed and if at least the Revenue Minister says that we can take it on such and such a day, I could have understood his point.

Sri MAHMOOD SHARIFF.—*Sine die* means what is postponed may be taken up at the next session.

Mr. SPEAKER.—It may be ballotted again.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—What you say is true. It may be ballotted again. One does not know one's luck. Sri M. Ramappa has moved it and it has come in the ballot. Unfortunately if I move the resolution I may not get the ballot. He may get a chance or not.

Secondly, I want to know what difficulty is there in the Government allowing this resolution to be discussed here and now. The only reason given is that 60 members have to speak. I do not think the Chair will allow that. Supposing there are 140 members to

speak, can you give opportunity to all persons? Our rules do not provide for it. How can the Chair take cognisance of such a reason? It is advanced in order to defeat the debate. That can never be taken seriously as a reason at all. The only other reason which is really serious is that they do not wish to take a decision on this resolution. They are in that unfortunate position. If the resolution is voted upon, then they will have to reject it; but they do not want to take that position; nor do they want to take the position of accepting it. Simply because the ruling party or the Government does not make up its mind, is it a valid reason for postponing it *sine die*? That can never be a true reason. That is a definite abuse of rules. The rules provide for the determination of issue or final opinion of the Assembly. When that is the rule, I do not think the spirit of the rules can be allowed to be violated in this manner by the Government. At least I can understand if Sri Ramappa comes forward by saying: “I am prepared to withdraw or I want a final closure of the motion.” But the Government themselves should not do it. If it is allowed, then only one course is open to us who do not agree with this and I only say we should not be allowed to the last resort to that extreme position of walking out of this House and registering our protest against the manner in which the Government is trying to take away our right.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would very much like that the matter should be kept distinct and clear and not mixed up. We are not debating upon the resolution which has been partially discussed and the debate not concluded. The present motion is that it be adjourned and the question was whether it applied to motions and resolutions. You have been pleased to give a ruling and I take it that it is not open to any debate. The two rules that arise for consideration in those circumstances are Rules 277 and 278. Rule 277 says:

“At any time after a motion has been made, a member may

(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)

move that the debate on the motion be adjourned."

You have been pleased to allow it under that. Then it was said that it amounts to an abuse of the rules of the Assembly. That portion is dealt with in Rule 278 (1) which runs thus :

"(1) If the Speaker is of opinion that a motion for the adjournment of a debate is an abuse of the rules of the Assembly, he may either forthwith put the question thereon from the Chair or decline to propose the question."

This is a rule which is binding upon the Speaker and if that is the option and if that is the ambit of the discretion of the Speaker, and if the motion is permitted to be made, it will certainly be proper to know the exact scope and ambit of the discretion. We are not discussing the old resolution which has been partially discussed. We are discussing the issue whether it should be adjourned or not and the suggestion that has been made, namely, that it amounts to an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly is already over. That stage is over and the Speaker, if he was of opinion that the motion for adjournment of a debate is an abuse of the Rules, two courses are open to the Speaker. There is no third course left open to the Speaker.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—He can say that only after hearing us.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Sri Narasimhan seems to think that it is necessary to hear everybody before he comes to a conclusion on a matter of facts; whether it is an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly or not is dependent upon events that have happened and if there was anything that Member wanted to contribute so that the Speaker may come to the conclusion that they want him to come to, it was necessary before it was permitted to be moved to show that it was an abuse of the Rules of the Assembly and in support of that

we may represent to the Chair about it, and the Chair may be pleased to ask, but if that has not been done and if the Speaker has come to the conclusion and after coming to the conclusion alone he can permit and after so permitting we have reached a stage where the motion has been moved by the Mover. What is more, to put it beyond any doubt, or debate, Sri Mallaradhya was pleased to say whether the mover has got anything to say in support of the motion. So, practically the mover has not only been made to move but also to make a speech in support of that.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—That question we have already concluded. The Hon'ble Chair has already told Sri Srinivas Shetty, the Leader of the Opposition, that we can persuade the Chair still to prove that it is an abuse of the rules. My friend is trying to argue that it is beyond consideration.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—No, no.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—He might say that the question which has been raised is wrong. But can he say you have already concluded and that it is not open to us to persuade you. He says that it does not arise at all.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I am happy that Sri Narasimhan has intervened and made me to focus on the point. Sir, if I may say so, with all respect to the Chair and through you to Sri Narasimhan that he has not properly understood the observations that were made by the Speaker. What you said, so far as I understand is, that it is perfectly open in the course of the debate to sustain on the ground that it is an abuse of the Rules with a view to get a majority and get it defeated. That is exactly the point. It is as much open to my friend to make comments as it is open to me. I say on reading the Rule; if it is an abuse of the Rules, only two courses are open; neither of these has been done. Therefore, practically it has become *functus officio* and it is not open to the Chair to say 'it is an abuse of the Rules, and therefore I disallow it.'

It is not open to the Opposition or anybody who oppose it to do so because it will really amount to an odium against the powers of the Speaker. Therefore, the scope of the present discussion is to come to a conclusion on this question, namely, whether it should be adjourned or not. That is the only point and nothing else.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—Who is to decide whether it is an abuse or not?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—So far as voting is concerned, it is not the Speaker but it is the House; so far as the discretion of the Speaker is concerned, it is the Speaker; the powers of the Speaker cannot be taken away by the House nor the powers of the House be taken away by the Speaker. It is in that light I am saying that the two points should be kept apart and not mixed up.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—We have tried to prove the dilatory tactics adopted by the Treasury Benches in this matter. My friend has not touched on that particular aspect. We are trying to prove to the Hon'ble Chair that all along the Treasury Benches, in trying to move this motion before this House, are adopting dilatory tactics. That is the burden of our allegation.

A MEMBER.—You are trying to contribute to that dilatoriness.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—It is perfectly open to the Members to derive pleasure by interpreting my remarks in any manner they like. But I have been explaining the position that it is open to the members so far as the debate on the present motion before the House is concerned, to say that it is worthwhile to postpone or not, but not to go on mixing up ideas and accuse the Government of dilatory tactics. The point is whether they want postponement or not. These are all things which have been stated more than once. But attributing motives will never serve the purpose, and to attribute dilatory tactics to me in particular is something which I want to repudiate, but still if they persist in entertaining them, I imagine they are

mostly ideas and they are welcome to have them.

4-30. P.M.

Sir, it was also said that the adjournment motion is not in order unless it does say that it has to be adjourned to a definite date. An adjournment motion may be of two types. One is to adjourn it to a definite known date. At the time when it is adjourned and the House takes a decision, the length of the adjournment motion, the ambit of the adjournment motion and the point to which it is adjourned are made known. That is not the only kind of adjournment motion. The other is adjourning *sine die* without fixing a date. It is very well known. It is in that light I say that we have to consider the effect of the words 'sine die.' 'Sine die' does not mean that it is not at all to be taken up, that it has to be rejected. Because, when it is adjourned it has to be taken up and it will be taken up at a later date which is determined later on.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Determined by whom? You are not going to determine. The ballot is going to be determined by the Secretary.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—My friend is rushing at a little faster pace than it is warranted. Who is to determine except this House? How is this House to determine except according to rules framed by this House? It is my friend who forgets. Are there no rules? If the rules have to be followed, they have to be followed. If it is not provided under the rules, it is open to us to amend the rules or bring it under the inherent powers of the Speaker. Certainly I cannot understand my friend saying—when has it to be taken up. When it has to be taken up has to be decided by this House. It is therefore I say that it is certainly not proper to attribute motives, reading something which is in their minds and not in my mind, and then saying this is what the Hon'ble Revenue Minister is trying to do or somebody is trying to do. These are platitudes.

SRI R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—*Sine die* has got a remedy under rule 30(2). I would like to know one thing from the Speaker. Under rule 30 (4), an adjournment motion has got to be given priority over other business. I would like to know whether this resolution has been given priority over other resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER.—It has got to be ballotted. The Hon'ble Member may read rule 30 (2):

“When the debate on a Private Members' Bill or resolution is adjourned *sine die*, the Member in charge of the Bill or the mover of the resolution, as the case may be, may if he wishes to proceed with such Bill or resolution on a subsequent day allotted for Private Member's business give notice for resumption of the adjourned debate and on receipt of such notice the relative precedence of such Bill or resolution shall be determined by ballot.”

Notice will have to be given.

SRI R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—The resolution of Sri Ramappa has been sent for discussion here now.

MR. SPEAKER.—Yes.

SRI R. CHENNIGARAMIAH.—Has it been given the priority over other resolutions?

MR. SPEAKER.—No. It ought not to have come before the House at all.

* ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶರಣಗೌಡ (ಜೇವರಗಿ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದ ಠರಾವನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ರೆವೆನ್ಯೂ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಏನು ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೋ ಅದರಿಂದ ನನಗೆ ಒಂದು ಬಹಳ ಗೊಡವಾದ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ ರೂಲ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ನಾನು ರೂಲ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಯ ಸದಸ್ಯನಾಗಿದ್ದೆ. ಆಗ ಈ ತರಹ ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಸಂಶಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ಆ ಕಮಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ವತಿಯಿಂದ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದಂಥ ಮನೋಭಾವ ಮತ್ತು ಈಗ ಈ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ರುವ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕುಗೂ ತಡೆಹಾಕುವಂಥ ಮೋಷನ್ ತಂದಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಆಶ್ಚರ್ಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವುದೂ ಸುರಕ್ಷಿತವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಭಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. Nothing is safe in the hands of the

Government because when this Government will come, in what way in what colour is not known. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಠರಾವು ಹೋದ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಬಂದು ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಜನ ಮಾತನಾಡಿ ಈಗ ಮುಗಿಯುವ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಯಲ್ಲತ್ತು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ closure motion ತಂದು ಮುಗಿಸುವುದನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟು ಇದರ ಮೇಲಿನ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಮೋಷನ್ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಇನ್ನು ಮುಂದೆ ಪ್ರತಿಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಠರಾವನ್ನು ತಂದಾಗ ಅದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಾರದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಠರಾವಿನ ನೂಟಕರು ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿದ ತಕ್ಷಣವೇ ಅದನ್ನು ಮುಕ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇವೊತ್ತು ತಂದಂತೆ 277ನೆಯ ರೂಲ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಒಂದು ಮೋಷನ್ ತಂದು ಅದನ್ನು ತಳ್ಳಿ ಹಾಕಬಹುದು. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ what is the purpose behind this ಎನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ರೂಲ್ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ, ರಾ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ತರಹ lacuna ಇರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಗಂಭೀರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಅಂಥ ಗಂಭೀರ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಠರಾವು ಪಾಸ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು, ಅಥವಾ ಬೀಳಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಮುಖ್ಯವಲ್ಲ. ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಅಸಂಭವ್ಯವಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಇರುವಂಥ ಸ್ವಯಂಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ನೀವು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವಂಥ ವಿಷಾದಕರ ಸಂಗತಿ ಉದ್ಭವಿಸಿದೆ. I am speaking about this main purpose. ನೀವು ಇಂಥದಕ್ಕೆ ಕೈಹಾಕಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಈಗಾಗರೇ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ವಯಂಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು, ನಮಗೆ ಘಟನಾವಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾನೂನುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಂಥ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು bypass ಮಾಡಿ ನಿಮಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲಿಸಿಂಥವಾದ ಆದರ್ಶಗಳು ಹೊರಟು ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿನ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಅನಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿದೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ,—ಸರ್ವಜುಡಿಸ್ ಆಗದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ—ನಾನಾವಿಧ ಕೇಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಹೈಕೋರ್ಟ್ ನಿರ್ದಯ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದನ್ನು bypass ಮಾಡಿ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆ...

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಆ ವಿಚಾರ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಆ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡಬೇಡಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಶರಣಗೌಡ.—ಈ ತರಹ ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಮೊಟಕುಮಾಡಲು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಯಾವರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಂಥ ದಿನ ಈ ಠರಾವನ್ನು ತರೋಣವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಆ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲ ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಟೈಜರಿ ಬೆಂಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿರುವುದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ದೊಡ್ಡ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯೇನಲ್ಲ. Larger interest of the country ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. I will tell you that everybody has larger interests in the

heart. ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೂ larger interest ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಭಿಮಾನವಿದೆ, ಸ್ವಾಭಿಮಾನವಿದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ larger interest safeguard ಮಾಡಿ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರು ಹೋಗಿ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕವಾದರೆ ಏನು, ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಎನ್ನುವ ಹೆಸರು ಹೋಗಿ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಹೆಸರು ಇದ್ದರೆ ಏನು. Larger interest ಹೇಗೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆನ್ನುವುದು ನನಗೆ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಬರೀ ನಿಮ್ಮ ದುರಭಿಮಾನ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಮತ್ತೇನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಎಂದು ಕರೆದರೆ ಏನೂ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲೇನೋ ಭಯವಿರುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೇಕೆ? ಮೊದಲನಿಂದಲೂ ವಿಶಾಲ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕವೆಂದು ಹೆಸರಿಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿರು ವಾಗ ವಿನಾ ಮೇಷ ನೋಡುವುದೇಕೆಂಬುದು ಅರ್ಥ ವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ದಿವಸ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಕಡಿಧಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದ ಮೋಷನ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೇಳು ವುದಾದರೆ ಹಾವು ಸಾಯಬಾರದು, ಕೋಲು ಮುರಿಯಬಾರದು ಎಂಬ ಗಾದೆಯೇ ನೀವು ಅದರಂತೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಅರ್ಥವೇನು? ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿ ಪ್ರಾಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ನಿರ್ಣಯ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳ ಬಾರದು. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಎಲ್ಲರೂ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾಗ ಈ ತರಹ ಒಂದು ಮೋಷನ್ ತಂದು 277ನೆಯ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ ಅರ್ಧ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಇರುವ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರೀವಿ ರೇಜಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯವಾಗಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಡಬಾರದೆಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—
On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is that point of order? There is no point of order, I know. Please resume your seat.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—
No, Sir; it is a point of order. The Chair must use its discretion when I am offering a novel suggestion. Hours are spent for nothing at all; Can you not allow me a minute, Sir?

(Laughter)

Mr. SPEAKER.—What is that point of order?

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—
Very popularly and less crudely I will put the point of order. We are living in the age of co-operation. There are brothers and the brother from Mysore has brought ten acres, the second brother from Bombay has brought four acres with him; the brother of Madras has brought only one acre and the Coorg son-in-law also comes and joins us.

(Loud laughter).

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, is it a point of order?

(Laughter)

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—
Therefore, even as per law, if you want to make anybody among them as the Chairman of the Co-operative Farming where they have all joined together, you must make him the Chairman who has brought ten acres of land with him.

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is no point of order. Please take your seat.

Sri M. MALLIKARJUNASWAMY.—
That is all, Sir; I have finished my point or order.

(Laughter.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—No point of order at all. If members raise unnecessary points of orders which are not obviously points of orders, it would mean that they only take time to speak. That is against the rules.

Sri G. SIVAPPA (Chitradurga).—
Sir, I beg to move for closure.

(Several Members of the Opposition interrupted).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Order, order. All the Hon'ble Members may resume their seats. Closure motion has been moved. So far as I am concerned, I allow the closure motion to be put before the House. There is no question of debate or any suggestion. When a closure motion is made and when the Speaker gives his consent, he will put the motion before the House. I put the formal motion.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, which is the formal motion?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, how can you put it to the House, without seconding?

Mr. SPEAKER.—For a simple thing, do not create unnecessarily so much of 'gadbad'.

“229. (1) At any time after a motion has been made, any member may move, 'That the question be now put', and, unless it appears to the Speaker that the motion is an abuse of these rules or an infringement of the right of reasonable debate, the Speaker shall then put the motion: 'That the question be now put'.

(MR. SPEAKER)

(2) Where the motion: "That the question be now put" has been carried, the question or questions consequent thereon shall be put forth with without further debate:

Provided that the Speaker may allow a member any right of reply which he may have under these rules."

So, I put the question: "That the question be now put."

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎಫ್. ಪುಟ್ಟಣ್ಣ.—ತಮ್ಮ ರೂಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಆಮೇಲೆ ಕ್ಲೋಜರ್ ಮೋಷನ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು.

MR. SPEAKER.—I can give a ruling afterwards. But I will give the ruling now. After all, there is no question of giving any ruling because it was not a point of order. It was a point of argument that was raised in the debate.

Rule 278 says:

"If the Speaker is of opinion that a motion for the adjournment of a debate is an abuse of the rules....."

I hold that this is not an abuse of the rules for adjournment. Now I will put the motion—the closure motion.

The question is "That the question be now put".

The motion was adopted.

SRI V. SRINIVAS SHETTY (Coondapur).—Sir, at this stage I want to say a word or two. Sir, according to the proceedings of this House it is obvious now that the brute majority of the Ruling Party makes it impossible for us to participate in this debate. They have not the common courtesy to allow a simple motion like this from the Opposition. They want to throttle the discussion like this. It is not decent or possible for us to take any part in a discussion like this.

[At this stage the Members of the Opposition withdrew from the House.]

ಶ್ರೀ ಕಡಿದಾಳ್ ಮಂಜಪ್ಪ (ಕಂದಾಯ ಶಾಖೆಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ

ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳು ನನ್ನ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ತೋಚಿದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಉಹಾಪೋಹಗಳನ್ನು ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಆಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಆದಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಸಂದಿಗ್ಧ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಒದಗಿದೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇಂತಹ ಒಂದು ವಿಧವಾದ ಸೂಚನೆಯನ್ನು ರವನ್ನೂ ಸಚಿವರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಕೆಲವರು "ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ" ಎಂಬ ಹೆಸರಿಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೆಲವರು ಅವರ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗೆ ಮತ್ತು ಸಭೆಯ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಏನೋ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆದಳಿತ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ವರ್ತಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಅವರ ವಾದಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ತಿರುಳಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಕಂಡು ಬರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡೆ. ನನ್ನ ಸೂಚನೆಯ ಹಿನ್ನೆರೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ದುರುದ್ದೇಶವೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಾನಾಗಲೇ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡ ಹಾಗೆ ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಸ್ವಾಮ್ಯವಾದ ನಿರ್ಣಯ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳಿವೆಯೇ, ಇಲ್ಲವೇ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ತೀವ್ರವಾದ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳೂ ಇವೆ; ಸೆಂಟಿಮೆಂಟಲ್ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವಂತೆ ಸೆಂಟಿಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೂಡ ಇದೆ. ಇಂತಹ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ಕೆಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ, ಇವೊತ್ತೇ ಮುಗಿಸಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದುದರಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನಿಧಾನವಾಗಿ ವಾತಾವರಣ ತೀಯಾದಾಗ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವಾದುದು. ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಇನ್ನಾವ ದುರಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳೂ ಇಲ್ಲ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಅರಿಕೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಶರಣಗೌಡರು ಮಾತನಾಡುವಾಗ, ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದ ಸ್ವಭಾವಸಿದ್ಧವಾದ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ಆರೋಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಭೆಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗಿರುವ ಹಕ್ಕು ಒಬ್ಬರಿಗೇ ಸೇರಿದ ಹಕ್ಕಲ್ಲ. ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಗೂ ಸೇರಿದ್ದು. ಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕಿಗೂ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು, ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಬ್ಬರ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಕ ಹಕ್ಕು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಎಲ್ಲ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಹಕ್ಕನ್ನು ಕಸಿದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಯತ್ನವನ್ನೇನೂ ಸರಕಾರದವರು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ವಿನಂತಿಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಕಾಲವನ್ನು ಚರ್ಚೆಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ಯಾವಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಇದನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಈ ಭಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದ ತೀವ್ರತೆ ಕಡಿಮೆಯಾದಾಗ, ವಾತಾವರಣ ತೀಯಾದಾಗ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಕಾಲ ಬಂದಾಗ ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲ ಜಾಗೃತೆ ಬರಲು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಈ

ನೀರ್ಣಯದ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಫಲವಾಗಿ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದುವರೆಗೆ ಆಗಿರುವ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಕೇವಲ ಎಂಟು ಅಥವಾ ಒಂಭತ್ತು ಜನ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ; ಇನ್ನೂ ಅನೇಕ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಸಲುವಾಗಿ ಭಾಗವಹಿಸುವವರಿಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ತಡೆಹಾಕುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಾರಣಗಳಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ರಾಮಪ್ಪನವರು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ನಿರ್ಣಯದ ಚರ್ಚೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದು ನೂಕುವೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಪಟ್ಟು ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

“That the debate on the Hon'ble Member Sri M. Ramappa's Resolution for changing the name of 'Mysore' to 'Karnataka State' be adjourned *sine die*.”

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Before we go to the next item, I would like to announce one thing. Some time back, Hon'ble Members will remember, I gave a ruling on the point of the resolution that was moved by Sri M. Ramappa. It was to the effect that the resolution subsisted. I made a reference to the Lok Sabha as to whether my ruling was correct or not, and I have got the letter from the Lok Sabha: I shall read out an extract from the letter.

“As regards your second point, rule 336 of the Lok Sabha Rules provides”

Of course, our rule is the same. The numbering is different.

“..... provides that ‘a motion, resolution or an amendment, which has been moved and is pending in the House, shall not lapse by reason only of the prorogation of the House.’...”

Our rule is 17. Their rule is 36.

“...In the Lok Sabha, therefore, when a member has moved a resolution but not concluded his speech and the session is prorogued, his resolution is not deemed to have lapsed and is put down as the first item under the proviso to rule 29 on the next day

allotted for that class of business in the next session. In a recent case on the 4th September, 1959, which was the last day allotted for Private Members' Resolutions during the 8th Session of Lok Sabha, Shri Prakash Vir Shastri moved a resolution for holding a session of Lok Sabha at Hyderabad or Bangalore every year but his speech on it was not concluded on that day. This resolution was put down as the first item in the List of Business for Private Members' Resolutions on the 20th November, 1959, which was the first day allotted for Private Members' Resolution during the following (9th) session, notwithstanding the fact that the President had prorogued the Lok Sabha on the 15th September, 1959.”

The Honourable Members will realise that the ruling that I gave was quite correct.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—If I followed it correctly about the letter that you have just now read to the House, there it is said that if the mover of a resolution has not concluded his speech, then that question be held over to the next session. That is the ruling if I have understood correctly.

Mr. SPEAKER.—When Sri Ramappa moved the resolution and had not concluded the speech, I made a reference to the Lok Sabha. This reply came on my reference after what happened here. There are also other rulings to that effect.

NON-OFFICIAL RESOLUTIONS

re. Implementation of Malaprabha Project.

Sri R. M. PATIL (Navalgund).—Sir, I move:

“That this Assembly is of opinion that in order to prevent constantly recurring famine conditions in Dharwar District, particularly in Navalgund,